

REMARKS

Summary of the Office Action

Claims 1-13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 2002/0131003 to Matsumoto in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,737,051 to Kondo et al.

Summary of the Response to the Office Action

Claims 1 and 8 have been amended to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the Applicant regards as the invention. Claims 14 and 15 have been added. Accordingly, claims 1-15 are presently pending.

All Claims Comply with 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1-13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 2002/0131003 to Matsumoto in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,737,051 to Kondo et al. To the extent that the Examiner may consider this rejection to still apply to independent claims 1 and 8, as amended, the rejection is respectfully traversed as being based upon references that do not anticipate the novel combination of features now recited in amended independent claims 1 and 8. For example, newly amended independent claim 1 now recites, amongst other features, “a metallic black matrix in the sealant region that extends into the array region of the first substrate” and “a color filter on the metallic black matrix extending into the array region from the sealant region.” Further, newly amended claim 12 now recites, amongst other features, “forming a metallic black matrix in the sealant region that extends into the array region of the first substrate” and “forming a color filter on the metallic black matrix extending

“into the array region from the sealant region.” Clear support for such amendments are found in Figures 4, 5, 6 and 7A-7C, and in paragraphs [0032] and [0035] of the present application.

In contrast to the presently claimed invention, Figure 4 of Matsumoto discloses a black matrix portion 202b that is **only** located in the sealant region of a display device. Thus, Matsumoto fails to disclose “a metallic black matrix in the sealant region that extends into the array region,” as recited in claims 1 and 8. Further, Matsumoto does not disclose “a color filter on the metallic black matrix extending into the array region from the sealant region,” as recited recited in claims 1 and 8 because Matsumoto discloses a color filter on a black matrix that is **only** located in the array region of a display device.

Applicant also respectfully submits that Kondo et al. does not cure the deficiencies of Matsumoto as discussed above with regard to newly-amended independent claims 1 and 8. More specifically, Kondo et al., either separately or combined with Matsumoto, do not describe or suggest “a metallic black matrix in the sealant region that extends into the array region of the first substrate” or “a color filter on the metallic black matrix extending into the array region from the sealant region.”

For at least the above reasons, Applicant respectfully asserts that the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejections is improper because Matsumoto, either alone or in combination with Kondo et al., does not teach or suggest all of the features recited in independent claims 1 and 8, as amended. Moreover, dependent claims 2-7 and 9-13 are allowable for the same reasons as discussed above and for the additional features that they recite. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of claims 1-13 be withdrawn.

New Claims 14 and 15 are Allowable

New claims 14 and 15 are allowable for the same reasons as discussed above because of their dependence on amended independent claims 1 and 8, and for the additional features that they recite.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and the timely allowance of the pending claims. Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of the response, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicant's undersigned representative to expedite prosecution.

If there are any other fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-0310. If a fee is required for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 not accounted for above, such an extension is requested and the fee should also be charged to our Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP


By: _____
Robert J. Goodell
Reg. No. 41,040

Dated: March 14, 2005

Customer No.: 009629
MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP
1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20004
Telephone: 202-739-7000
Facsimile: 202-739-3001